



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,196	08/02/2001	Gregory Maurice Plow	STL920000036US1	1401

7590 05/24/2005

John L. Rogitz
Rogitz & Associates
Suite 3120
750 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

EXAMINER

UNGAR, DANIEL M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,196

Applicant(s)

PLOW ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel M. Ungar

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. 112

2. In response to amendments and/or arguments as to the indefiniteness of claims, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to claims 1, 2, 14, and 21 are withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. 102

3. Applicants' amendments to the claims necessitated a new search which revealed the prior art and new grounds for rejection presented in this Office action.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action.

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14, 17-19, 21, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Pennell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication Number U.S. 2002/0013788 A1.

6. Regarding claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-19, 21, 24-26, Pennell et al. disclose a method for automatically inputting user information to an electronic form provided to a user from a server comprising receiving the electronic form at the user computer requiring user input (see paragraphs 0022-0024; claim 1); retrieving user information from memory and automatically inputting the user information to the electronic form (see paragraphs 0024, 0028, 0034; claim 37, 38); updating the user information stored in the user computer in response to a user manually inputting data to the form (see paragraph 0032; claim 1);

providing a menu of user names each corresponding to a respective autofill profile, and allowing a user to select a name from the menu (see paragraphs 0029, 0033).

7. Regarding claim 14, Pennell et al. disclose encrypting the autofill profile and saving the autofill profile (see paragraph 0032; claim 1).

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 5-8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennell et al., as established above, in view of Kikinis, U.S. Patent Number 5,794,259.

10. Regarding claims 5, 6, 13, 20 and 27, although Pennell et al. disclose encrypting and saving the autofill profile (see paragraph 0032-0033), they do not specify establishing a PIN to access the information. Nevertheless, restricting access to encrypted files by way of a PIN was well known in the art at the time of the invention. Kikinis discloses, in a similar field of endeavor, storing the data of an autofill profile in encrypted form, accessible by a password (see column 4, lines 32-34). Note that "Personal Identification Number" may be synonymous with "password". Newton's Telecom Dictionary defines "PIN Number" as: A group of characters entered as a secret code to gain access to a computer system (see entries for "Personal Identification Number" and "PIN Number"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have required the use of a PIN to access the protected, encrypted information in order to authenticate the proper user with a access code that only the proper user would know.

11. Regarding claim 7, 15, and 22, Kikinis discloses the use of a password to access the personal information at which time the information is requested, as outlined above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have required the use of a PIN to access the protected, encrypted information in order to authenticate the proper user with a access code that only the proper user would know.

12. Regarding claim 8, 16, and 23, Pennell et al. disclose automatically inputting user information from the autofill profile to the electronic form (see paragraph 0034; claim 37-38), as outlined above. Further, Pennell et al. disclose saving the profile in encrypted form, deeming it inherent that the profile is decrypted upon use. However, Pennell et al. do not disclose access to the profile based specifically on a correct PIN, as stated above. Nevertheless, restricting access to encrypted files by way of a PIN was well known in the art at the time of the invention. Kikinis discloses, in a similar field of endeavor, storing the data of an autofill profile in encrypted form, accessible by a password (see column 4, lines 32-34). Note that "Personal Identification Number" may be synonymous with "password". Newton's Telecom Dictionary defines "PIN Number" as: A group of characters entered as a secret code to gain access to a computer system (see entries for "Personal Identification Number" and "PIN Number"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have required the use of a PIN to access the protected, encrypted information in order to authenticate the proper user with a access code that only the proper user would know.

CONCLUSION

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory

period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel M. Ungar whose telephone number is 571.272.7960. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 Monday - Thursday, Alt. Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571.272.3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2132



Daniel M. Ungar



GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100